REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were pending as of the action mailed March 22, 2007.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 16 and 18 are being amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found at least on page 3, line 24-27 and FIGs. 6A and 6B of the application. No claims are being cancelled. No claims are being newly added.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Drawings

In the applicant's response to the previously received Office Action of May 17, 2006, the applicant requested that the examiner indicate that the drawing sheets, filed on May 5, 2004, are acceptable.

The applicant again respectfully requests that the examiner indicate that the drawing sheets 1-10 (FIGS. 1-9) mailed on May 5, 2004, are acceptable.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. To expedite prosecution and without prejudice, claim 1 have been amended to overcome the rejection. Withdraw of the rejection of claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,453,356 ("Sheard") in further view of "Pure Java Server Pages", published: June 08, 2000, Pages: 1-4, la, 2a, 3a, 4a, and Gl ("Goodwill") and 4GuysFromRolla.com published: March 3, 2003, pages 1-5 ("Leech").

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites providing a server-side framework to an application, where the framework supports predefined data types. The claims also recites using an object to store values of one of the predefined data types in <u>both a transfer format and a process format</u>. The

value in the transfer format from the object is used to generate markup language pages, which are sent to a browser. A new value received from the browser is stored in the object and the object automatically coverts and checks the new value. Only after the new value is converted and found to be compliant is the new value provided to the application.

The applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed or suggested by the references the examiner has cited. Instead, the individual references separately disclose elementary concepts of data conversion and error checking that have routinely been carried out by applications. In contrast, claim 1 specifically recites that an object for storing a value of a particular data type supported by a server-side framework is requested by an application. In response to the application request, the object is created and used to store values of the data type in both process and transfer formats. Additionally, the object is used both to generate a markup language page that includes the value and to store a new value received from a browser that had received the generated page. The object (not the application) automatically converts and checks the new values before forwarding the value to the application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 corresponds to claim 1 and was rejected for the same reasons. Accordingly, the application respectfully submits that claim 13 and claims 14-15, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1.

Claim 16 corresponds to claim 1 and was rejected for the same reasons. Accordingly, the application respectfully submits that claim 16 and claims 17-18, which depend from claim 16, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding to the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Reiner Hammerich et al.
Serial No. : 10/760,135
Filed : January 16, 2004
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-193001 / 2001P00021
WOUS

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 May 07

/Hans R. Troesch/
Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No. 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50417295